

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 09/905,769 07/13/2001 Roger L. Frick 30203/37265 3575 4743 7590 05/03/2004 **EXAMINER** MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP AMARI, ALESSANDRO V 6300 SEARS TOWER ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 233 S. WACKER DRIVE CHICAGO, IL 60606 2872

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•			- An
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	M
Advisory Action	09/905,769	FRICK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alessandro V. Amari	2872	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 09 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application and indicate of the contraction of the contract of the con	ation. A proper reply high places the applica	y to a ition in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
 a)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mai	unt of the fee. The approriginally set in the final	opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	•		
2. \boxtimes The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	s.
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ requesting requesting the application in condition for allowance becaused. 6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ecause: See Continuation Sheet.		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: <u>29-31,33-35 and 47</u> .			
Claim(s) objected to: 7,8 and 23.			
Claim(s) rejected: 1-6,9-12,14,15,18-22 and 24-28.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 16,17 and 3	<u>36-46</u> .		
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	it(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	.	
10. Other:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
	MARK A. PRIMARY	ROBINSON EXAMINER	

Continuation of 2. NOTE: the new issue is directed to the proposed language further defining the incident light signal being reflected into the non-guiding propagation region for propagation within a second plane forming an acute angle with the first plane wherein the first plane and the second plane extend orthogonally to the surface.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the claims as finally rejected do not distinguish th claimed integrated optical device from the prior art cited .